

**New York Tribune**  
First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

**SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1916.**

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 410 Broadway, New York. Telephone: 410-411. Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Please send address changes to New York Tribune, New York, N. Y.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES:**—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.

**FOREIGN RATES:**—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50; 3 mos. \$3.50; 6 mos. \$6.50; 1 year \$11.00.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50; 3 mos. \$3.50; 6 mos. \$6.50; 1 year \$11.00.

**CANADIAN RATES:**—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

**A Lost Opportunity.**

Every step in the mobilization of the state militia brings fresh evidence of the blunders in military policy made in the Hay army reorganization law. It is evident that the National Guard units which have gone to the front cannot be properly organized and trained for service within six months. If the entire Guard is recruited to war strength, it will take nearly a year and a half to equip, discipline and educate it for real campaign work.

But if the emergency passes and war is avoided the Guard will be sent home and reconverted into state militia. The conditions which prevailed before mobilization will return. The experience of mobilization at war strength will be in large measure wasted, because its benefits will not have gone in any considerable measure to that portion of the military establishment which is always active and which under all circumstances must constitute our first fighting line.

If Congress had had the foresight to pass last year, or even this year, a law giving the regular army a minimum peace strength of 250,000 enlisted men the mobilization now under way would have put the new military system at once on its feet. It would have enabled the War Department to get into the field a real regular army large enough to deal with any and all of the problems on the Mexican border. And that army, once created, could have been maintained permanently, all the experience of the men and officers, gained in service under conditions somewhat similar to those of actual war, accruing to the benefit of the first line, not, as now, 20 per cent of it going to the first line and 80 per cent of it to a second line, soon to drop back into civilian pursuits.

What is needed most of all in our military establishment is training for the regular troops and the regular officers. Unless troops are handled continually as complete divisions the higher command in the army cannot learn its trade. Nor can the staff corps master the problems with which a real war would overwhelm them. We must have a mobile army large enough to be organized in accordance with modern methods of warfare. Otherwise our regular establishment must remain a mere toy for military amateurs to play with.

When Senator Chamberlain was trying to cover over his backdown to Mr. Hay on the army reorganization bill he talked about a force of more than 200,000 men that was going to be created by that measure. In the debate in the House of Representatives the other day on the annual army appropriation bill it was disclosed that appropriations were to be made for the support of only 105,000 combatant enlisted men in 1916-17. And this estimate included not only the first of the five increments to the regular army under the Hay law, but also the 20,000 additional men authorized by an emergency resolution passed a couple of months ago.

Deducting from the 105,000 combatants in the regular army the garrisons in the Philippines, Hawaii, the Canal Zone and Alaska, the Porto Rico regiment and the coast artillery corps, we have left a mobile army within continental United States of less than 50,000 enlisted combatants. If the overseas garrisons were maintained at a proper strength, we should have practically no mobile army at all in continental United States on the basis of a total strength of only 105,000.

A great opportunity was lost in 1915 and 1916 to create a real American army. We are now sending to the border more than 100,000 Guardsmen to do work which could have been done far more economically and with enormously greater benefit to the country through a much smaller increase in the strength of the regular army. We are now carrying to a wasteful, though logical, conclusion the policy of military non-preparedness and inefficiency successfully championed in Congress for two years past by Mr. Hay.

**Education Budget Publicity.**

When the Board of Education was reorganized, following the election of Mr. Willcox as President, it was predicted that there would be no further unseemly disputes with other city departments. This seems to be borne out by the announcement that there will be no opposition this year to analysis of the proposed budget of the department by the Bureau of Standards of the Controller's office, which performs this function of dissecting the proposed budgets of other city departments and furnishes, by reason of this process, much valuable information for the Board of Estimate.

This is an eminently sensible position for Mr. Willcox and his associates to take. It forms a gratifying contrast to the attitude of the people who controlled the Education Board's policies in other years. That body is not sacred and its decisions

are not infallible. Its work is vastly important, but that does not give it a claim to all the money it asks for, free from check or scrutiny by the appropriating authorities. Yet that seemed to be the notion previous boards held of their place in the scheme of things.

Under the present arrangement the Education Department will fare just as do other city departments. New York does not grudge money for teaching its children, but the taxpayers have a right to the fullest publicity regarding such expenditures, and the Board of Estimate has a right to all the information it can get. It is certain that there will be no act resulting from this to lessen the schools' efficiency, though there may appear ways to lessen the department's expenditures.

**Extend Cooper Union's Facilities.**

Cooper Union does its excellent work so quietly, so smoothly, so unostentatiously, that there was something of a shock in the announcement that its endowment was not large enough to meet the demands on the institution. But where 8,000 apply for admission in a year and only 3,400 can be accommodated, manifestly there is need for expansion and reason for the appeal for funds from the public to finance this extension of the work.

New York has reason to be proud of Cooper Union—proud of the spirit which founded it, proud of the spirit of the students who go there, obtaining an education by struggle and self-sacrifice. That spirit is a fine and valuable thing, deserving all the aid and encouragement this great and prosperous city can give it. Cooper Union's requests are modest. All the money needed ought to be forthcoming speedily, so this splendid work for the city may go on unhampered.

**A Traitor's Plea.**

Sir Roger Casement's eloquent appeal to "a larger court" is described by one witness as "perhaps the most remarkable speech ever delivered by a prisoner from the dock." As a rhetorical effort it was doubtless impressive, but in the light of reason it will not stand examination, for it was founded from first to last upon an assumption that is demonstrably absurd. It was founded on the assumption that the wrong he had done was against England alone, and that now his life was forfeit only "for an exercise of his conscience" in "adhering to his own people," in asking them "to fight for their rights."

The plea might be fair enough if anything approaching unanimity existed in Ireland. But Sir Roger Casement knows well that he has the support of only a very small proportion of Irishmen. A moderate estimate of the number of his countrymen who gave their services to the army and navy in the present war is 150,000, and this does not include the many Irishmen recruited in Great Britain and serving in English and Scottish regiments, nor does it take into account the large numbers in the Colonial armies.

Compulsion has never been applied in Ireland, and it cannot be pretended that these men were forced into the services against their will. Sir Roger Casement, being an Irishman himself, will hardly agree with the Vereker, Cohalans and their like in this country who never scruple to attribute the basest motives to Irishmen who have joined with France and England against Germany. He must know that they are not all governed by sordid motives and that they have not been tricked into "fighting England's battles" against the manifest interests of their own country. How, then, can he justify his mad project as a service to his countrymen? Are none but the fanatics of Sinn Fein worthy of consideration?

Yet if he dies Sir Roger Casement will have all the glory of martyrdom. The Irishmen shot down by snipers in the streets of Dublin had not that consolation. The thousands of young Irishmen who have died in Flanders count for nothing. But Casement, his betrayer, is destined to be a hero and a martyr because his enterprise was mad, ill timed and destined from the first to bring nothing but misery and suffering upon his own countrymen.

**Bakst at the Hippodrome.**

That new spirit of enterprise which has taken the Hippodrome by its unwieldy proscenium arch and lifted it into the land of real entertainment and much profit is obviously responsible for the dash of Bakst with which its new show will be seasoned. We had our fill of Bakst and Bakst design in the Russian ballet; and if it did not persuade us of its utter artistic verity, it did give us many joyous moments. Joy is what we can expect from the proposed Bakst designs for the Hippodrome. And in this world of sin and warfare a splash of riotous good cheer is not to be despised.

Let us hope that this strictly commercial experiment with the new art of the theatre will stir a little action out of our generously conservative stage. We had our "Sumurun" several ages ago, and enjoyed it; but ripples from its splash in the pool have been few enough. Reinhardt remained an alien name and not much to swear by. Our scene painters, for the greater part, stuck to the good, old time-tried fashions. When Mr. Granville Barker last year suddenly unrolled his "Androcles" and "The Man Who Married a Dumb Wife" before us we had almost forgotten that such things could be.

It is not that we ignorant Americans have set our affections upon Mr. Gordon Craig's theories or any other particular development of stage art. We simply feel rather out of the current, that is all. It was a good American, Mr. Robert Jones, that an Englishman, Mr. Granville Barker, introduced to us in the delightful pattern of "The Man Who Married a Dumb Wife." We sat and were thrilled not only by the stage set and the individual costumes, but by the fashion in which the splashes of color were moved about to form and reform over fresh and significant designs—as if an artist's brush were working before us on an old yet ever changing canvas.

We were face to face with something new and worth while, and we were mildly amazed that with such richness in our midst we had never heard of it.

Now we have had our "Caliban," with its Ordynski-Jones-Urban originality. We are to have our Bakst at the Hippodrome. And there are reports that no less conservative a spot than the Metropolitan Opera House is to give Mr. Jones a chance amid its traditional melodramatic elaborations. Things are distinctly looking up. The stage of the chromo may yet yield to better things even in America.

**Real Homes for Orphans.**

Charities Commissioner Kingsbury's new plan for placing dependent children between two and eight years of age in homes instead of Homes has much in its favor. There can be no question of the desirability of giving a child the care and human relationship it can get in a household instead of the treatment it would get in an institution, even the best run and most efficient kind of institution. Catholics, Jews and Protestants united in approving that treatment of dependents, where possible, at the White House conference of 1909. It has been put into operation in various states. The same idea lies behind the so-called widows' pension law in this state.

The lamentable condition of many institutions where child dependents of the city had been placed, as disclosed by the investigation conducted by Second Deputy Commissioner Doherty, gives especial reason for the immediate adoption of this new method of providing for the city's wards. There ought to be no opposition from any religious body, because the children will be placed with families of their own creed. It goes without saying that there will be ample preliminary investigation of the households to which they are intrusted, and the Commissioner promises that special effort will be made to make the child and the household fit.

This is an important and a wholesome departure from present methods. It has been successful elsewhere; it ought to be successful here. For the possibility of beginning this work thanks are due to a group of generous and public-spirited citizens who have raised a fund to pay all the administrative expenses of the new bureau. The city owes much to their initiative and open-handedness. The children, whose lives should express the difference between a home, with its personal care, and the routine of an institution—the regulation "orphan asylum"—will owe a great deal more.

**FOR UNDILUTED AMERICANISM**

**A German-American Newspaper Defines Its Attitude Toward Mr. Hughes.**

(From The Milwaukee Germania-Herald.)

During the Republican National Convention there appeared in the Chicago papers as a paid advertisement an editorial from the bitterly anti-German New York Tribune, in which Justice Hughes was represented as the candidate of the German-Americans, who meant to use him as their tool to punish the present President for having only partially fulfilled his orders from Potsdam. The convention did not, however, succumb to this simple swindle, but nominated Hughes on the third ballot. Now the opponents of Mr. Hughes are taking the opposite tack. They obviously want to get him to say something which will make it impossible for American citizens of German descent to come out for him. It is clear that he was asked how he meant to act on the alleged offer of support by the German-Americans only for that reason. The Republican candidate answered that he had already indicated his standpoint with sufficient precision in his dispatch to the chairman of the convention. He said his Americanism was undiluted and whoever supported him would support an American and nothing else.

Since the motive of the questioners was quite clear and since the question itself was in certain respects an insult to him, it would perhaps have been just as well if Mr. Hughes had turned his back without a word of answer. But, since he had not the slightest reason for evading the question, he complied. And we are glad to be able to give him credit for not merely finding the right answer, but the only answer that he could properly give. Those people who sought to set a trap for him got just the opposite of what they were looking for. For Americans of German descent, far from being disatisfied with Mr. Hughes's answer, are rather completely satisfied with it. Mr. Hughes hasn't a single drop of German blood in his veins. Like Mr. Wilson, he is an American of English descent. We never had the slightest reason to suppose that he felt particularly friendly toward Germany's cause. It is even possible, if not probable, that he stands on the other side in his sympathies. But that is a thing for him to decide for himself. Sympathies are just as free as thoughts. The only thing that interests us is that, if he enters the White House, he will not follow the example of his predecessor by allowing himself to be led by his sympathies into an unequal treatment of the belligerent powers. His answer has completely assured us on this point. If he is elected, citizens of German descent, as well as all other good citizens wherever they may have been born, will get just what they want—an undiluted American who will preserve an honest neutrality, favor neither of the two belligerent parties and consider himself only as the appointed defender of the rights of the country.

**Building a Ship Every Day**

(From The Philadelphia Ledger.)

United States yards are building a new ship every day. It is a record never before equaled in our country and is the sequel to our stupendous exports at a time when world commerce is upset by a world war.

There are now building or under construction 368 steel vessels, the aggregate of whose tonnage exceeds 1,129,000. Ships bearing the Stars and Stripes have more than doubled since the war began, and the increase is still going on at high tide. Prior to August, 1914, less than a tenth of America's foreign commerce was carried in American ships, but at the present rate of building new ones the period following the end of the war will see a totally different story. The business of transporting over five billions of exports and imports is a trade worth going after, and keeping after till we get it.

**"LET US BE JUST"**

**Dr. Rainsford Calls the Sending of Militia to Mexico a Crime.**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: No saner, no more timely writing on this inexcusable muddle of the Mexican proposition has appeared anywhere than The Tribune's article in this morning's issue, June 29: "Let Us Be Just."

Why this sudden tumult of confused hurry? We have been for three long years doing every foolish thing that a prejudiced, self-satisfied and incompetent Executive—going its own way, turning down all advice from the accredited diplomatic representatives of the country and scouting all appeals from hundreds and thousands of our suffering citizens in Mexico—could lead the United States into doing.

We have interfered—declaring we would not interfere. We have put arms in our enemies' hands, and so mismanaged things that not only have we strengthened the criminal elements but have aroused the latent and honest national feeling of a largely ignorant population against us.

We may have to police a part of the country, at least for some time. If so, one thing is clear as day; it is this: These National Guard regiments are pouring down, at the unhealthy season of the year, green boys and men, insufficiently equipped, officers inexperienced, splendid material, if you will, but at present totally unfitted for any kind of war, least of all for such a war, are not fit for the job.

And why is it all done? Just to save "the face" of a willfully obstinate, willfully ignorant politician.

Had we Mr. Garrison's proposed law in force giving us 400,000 volunteers, under federal enlistment, at least a beginning would now be possible. The men could be drilled and organized and in six months would be perfectly ready to deal with any Mexican situation.

We have not got them, and unprepared boys that are going cannot take their places. I hold that to send them to do so is a crime. It is "playing at ideals with other people's blood."

W. S. RAINSFORD.  
Ridgefield, Conn., June 29, 1916.

**The Militia's Term of Service.**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: I read with considerable satisfaction your editorial in to-day's issue entitled, "Let Us Be Just," and I am sure every one not suffering from war hysteria will agree with you.

Having had some experience in examining, physically, men for the National Guard, I have been struck by the common idea that they were enlisting only for the time that we might have trouble with Mexico. In other words, the idea is that they will be discharged as soon as the trouble is ended. There having, as yet, been no declaration of war, these men necessarily signed blanks for the regular three years' enlistment. Can they be held to this?

I have been given to understand that after July 1, 1916, the government will have the power to send those having sworn into the federalized militia out of the country. If so, will it be possible to substitute in the Philippines the scouts by militia in the event of the country being called for service in Mexico? In the event of the present trouble ending without war how will the men obtain their discharges?

ROBERT P. WHITE.  
Jersey City, June 29, 1916.

**The Lesson of Mobilization.**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: New Yorkers and citizens of the United States in general are beginning to realize as never before that the bombastic utterances of flamboyant and windy patriots about the million or more citizens who will be cheerfully "stand by" at the first bugle call for volunteers between sunup and sundown are false pure and simple. We are beginning to realize that our National Guard, who have truthfully tried to become prepared with the meagre allowances given to them, are sadly lacking in equipment, some of it absolutely necessary.

We are lacking in horses, we are lacking in guns, we are lacking in many units that go to make up a modern system for open fighting. We are not lacking in money, we are not lacking in genuine patriotism, we are not lacking in willingness on the part of our young and sturdy manhood to "stand by" Old Glory and die fighting for it, if necessary. Hence, these multiplied thousands of our sturdy citizens should be fully guaranteed and protected by the actions of our officials by giving to them a heaping measure of preparedness, so that they may with confidence go forth and face their enemies, if enemies there are to be faced, in an orderly, decent military equipped manner. It gives courage and more confidence in the country; it gives the mass of the people, more particularly the lady relatives, more confidence in their officials; it gives to the nation more of the respect of other nations, and with that respect will come the desire on the part of other nations to let this nation alone, for the simple reason that they find us prepared.

Now is the time to memorize the lesson. It is not yet too late if we only put this shoulder to the wheel. Let us make up this deplorable shortage in equipment just as fast as the goods are obtainable. The will to do is a wonderful thing, but the implements to work with are vastly more important.

FRIENDSHIP GLOUCESTER.  
New York, June 30, 1916.

**The Might to Enforce Right.**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: Before the war the pacifists in Europe were saying that adequate preparedness for national defence was "an unnecessary expense" because in this "enlightened age" war was "impossible and entirely unprofitable," and they fought preparedness by sarcastically asking against whom they were to prepare. Now they have found out, but they did not find out until the German enemy had invaded neutral Belgium in violation of world law.

The peace-at-any-price people in America are not at all afraid that any military and aggressive foreign nation will ruthlessly wrong us with its power, but they are so unpatriotic as to want America to be powerless, fearing that if we have any military and naval power we will wrong other nations with it.

Is it not insane to presume that a good nation like America will cease to do right because it has the power to do so?

According to the pacifists, there is nothing to our doctrine that often "might makes right." Our motto is "Use Without Abuse." We contend that might can either be used or misused; that right can always triumph when backed by greater power than the opposing wrong, and vice versa. We therefore insist that America must be always right and ever have the might to enforce it.

RATCLIFFE HILLS.  
Hartford, Conn., June 29, 1916.

**"The Day of Deliverance."**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: Bravo, bravissimo! for your beautiful editorial "The Day of Deliverance," printed in The Tribune of to-day. Give us some more from time to time. The Tribune is certainly the best paper in America, and the most interesting.

G. B.  
Brooklyn, June 29, 1916.



**MR. HUGHES'S AMERICANISM**

**No Hyphen Love for Him—Only Hatred for President Wilson.**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: I notice that there is an effort being made for political purposes to misrepresent the attitude of Charles E. Hughes, the Republican candidate for President, by claiming that he is the candidate of the hyphenated German-Americans. This cheap political trick will not succeed. The German-Americans may be for Hughes, and why should they not be? If they are for Hughes it is not because he is not a true and loyal American, but it is because they will not support President Wilson, and therefore in order to defeat him they must support the Republican candidate. This is all there is to this question. It is not that the German-Americans love Hughes more, but Wilson less. Therefore to impugn the patriotism of Hughes or his Americanism because a certain class of citizens support him in preference to the Democratic candidate is a cheap and dishonorable trick that can be promoted only by small politicians.

In this connection I wish to say that I believe that it is natural for an American citizen of German extraction to sympathize with Germany as against England or Russia or France, but to say that such a citizen would necessarily sympathize with Germany as against America is an entirely different question. I believe that a great majority of the so-called German-American citizens would be loyal to the American flag against any country, including Germany.

We hear a great deal these days about Americanism. This issue has been raised by politicians for the purpose of creating a popular issue upon which they can ride into office. The Republican slogan in this campaign should be "Protection, Prosperity, Preparedness and Patriotism."

Patriotism includes Americanism. A patriot is a fellow citizen without regard to his place of birth. Patriotism is love of country and a zealous desire to serve our country's best interests. Whether native or naturalized, of whatever race or creed, we have but one country, and if we are patriots we are American and the hyphen disappears. A citizen cannot be a patriot without being an American, but he can be an American without being a patriot.

This idea of patriotism has been so much emphasized and clearly expressed than by the Republican candidate for President, Mr. Hughes, in the following words:

"I stand for an Americanism that knows no ulterior purpose, for a patriotism that is single and complete. Whether native or naturalized, of whatever race or creed, we have but one country, and we do not for an instant tolerate any division of allegiance."

CHARLES H. BETTS,  
Editor of "The Lyons Republican,"  
Lyons, N. Y., June 29, 1916.

**Greetings from a Veteran.**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: It warms the hearts of us old veterans and vividly recalls and revives the memory of those stirring scenes that were so familiar to us fifty years ago, when we as lads in the prime of our youth responded so promptly to our country's call in the hour of danger and in the dark days of the Rebellion.

Oh, how proudly we marched down Broadway, amid the cheers of the thousands who lined the streets! How we were dragged from the ranks by our mothers, wives and sweethearts, who embraced and wept over us! We were not mobilized in those days, but were sent to the front at once into the heart of the enemy's country to fight those who so bravely fought for a lost cause.

God bless those lads who for the past few days have been passing through the city! A more noble or manly looking lot of lads would be hard to find, with that intense display of patriotism and determination to protect and maintain the honor of our country and defend our dear old flag, the Stars and Stripes, the most beautiful emblem that has ever floated over God's footstool.

We old veterans wish you God's speed. May you return to your loved ones crowned with glory!

In regard to us, the old veterans, we say it with a certain degree of sadness. We are going down the shady side of the valley,

**The Crime of the Kaiser.**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: While The Tribune is nearly always right and is right in characterizing the Lusitania sinking as a crime, it seems to me it is all wrong to charge it all to Germany. While Germany must be held responsible for the acts of the Emperor, we in America should look upon it as a crime chargeable only to the "one-man power" the Kaiser. No one who knows the real, manly instinct of the German population can believe for a moment that honest, manly Germans—such as in the main represent the German population in America—approve of murder. The hyphenates are a class to themselves, many of them men who would not hesitate to commit murder or any other crime to accomplish their ends, men who should promptly be driven from the land in which they have sought shelter and protection. Let us credit the German population as a mass with a desire to be faithful to their oath, and as men who are not unwilling to serve honestly and to faithfully support the country they have accepted as their home.

The crime so often attributed to Germany and for which it would appear that Germany must be held responsible is a crime for which the Kaiser, in his madness and his desire to seize Belgium, must alone be held responsible. Germany was peaceful and quiet until a mad Emperor forced his people to war. It was the crime of one man calling around him a band of murderers, not the crime of the German people. The "one-man power" should end with the war.

C. AUGUSTUS HAVILAND.  
New York, June 29, 1916.

**What, Never?**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: In to-day's issue of your paper there appears a cartoon of the Honorable Charles E. Hughes and Colonel Roosevelt at dinner. The cartoonist has placed a partly consumed cigar in the hand of Mr. Hughes and an ash-tray near by. Mr. Hughes does not use tobacco.

I am very sure that The Tribune does not purpose to misrepresent either persons or facts, and it has taken a very positive stand in this matter in relation to advertisements. Consequently, I am confident that you will publish this letter correcting the wrong impression made by the said cartoon upon the minds of those not acquainted with the facts. This correction is due, not only Mr. Hughes, but also the youth of our land, who are influenced for or against a poison addiction by example.

It is of interest and importance to note that our President and the two former Presidents do not use tobacco—a valuable example to a people the majority of whom are too prone to follow the common throng.

CHAS. G. PEASE,  
President Non-Smokers' Protective League of America.  
New York, June 29, 1916.

**A Few Lines of Rejoicing.**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: Anticipating by a few hours what Theodore Roosevelt is going to say, I am writing these few lines of rejoicing over the fact that the Elephant and the Moose are to team together on the political highway next November.

I have great respect for President Wilson's scholarship and love of country. I have little respect for the exhibition of statesmanship which has characterized the Democratic bungler in Mexican diplomacy. Fifty years ago The New York Tribune criticized our governmental policy in dealing with Mexico. We have evidently learned but little since then. We treated the Mexicans like children when we attempted to say who they might have or not have for President. We switched our own choice from Villa to Carranza, and then began to quarrel with our last choice. We are now roaring indignation because a people whom we call unfit for government do not manifest fitness in their dealings with us. We are going to jump on them unless they beg our pardon for resisting our interference in their affairs. Shades of all the great departed, what are we coming to!

C.  
Minneapolis, Minn., June 26, 1916.

**A LEGAL MILL**

**How the Jefferson Market Night Court for Women Impresses an Observer.**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: The public spirited letter signed "American Citizen" in last Sunday's Tribune, concerning his experiences as a visitor to the Jefferson Market Night Court for Women, and depicting the methods of procedure pursued in the trials of the unfortunate women prisoners, and the letter on the same subject in your issue of June 30, signed "V. V. P.," move me to a similar criticism.

This court was primarily instituted for hearing cases against women of the streets, so called. In the beginning it was thought to set aside a court and formulate such procedure and assign such judges as would serve to bring into being a thoughtful, useful court with sympathetic, tolerant and trained judges, clerks and police officers, peculiarly adapted to reform or help this class of unfortunate.

A court which would proceed gravely and deliberately in this task of protecting the public on the one hand and these, for the most part, defenseless women on the other, unhampered by the cold and unbending rigors of the ordinary police court procedure.

One has but to attend a night session to become disillusioned and heart sick at the dreary waste of it all and the ill directed efforts, or lack of efforts, at reformation. The relentless mill grinds its human grist nightly. The lack of sentiment and the complete want of human pity with which the calendar is hastily called and impatiently disposed of; and the spying and the obvious lying, and the text shown by the "officer" who made the arrest and gathered the evidence, the hasty judgments delivered; the degrading, thumb-screw operation of finger printing, make the judicious grieve.

I do not wonder that your correspondents are moved to express themselves publicly as they did. One asks himself whether the wholesale, feelingless transaction taking place nightly can bring any good in its train. The casual visitor involuntarily cries out against what he instinctively feels is a veritable debauchery of oaths, trickery and conscienceless treachery in the unequal matching of wits between the women on one side and the specially detailed young men, bedecked with their badge of office, on the other. One feels ashamed of his kind when he hears these young fellows glibly and gleefully reciting under oath their catchword phrases, and utterly the same in each case, and one wonders why this great civilized community will permit its Police Department, now presided over by a conscientious and able Commissioner, to send these young men to function as spies and worse in this unwholesome trade.

In passing, I might remark that a custom has grown up, ripened almost, but not quite, into a rule of evidence, under which the presiding magistrate (with the highest motive) singularly enough takes the unsupported word of these officers against the word of the women. The sordid struggle before the bar of this court usually resolves itself into a plain issue between the informer and the defendant.

The community must be aroused to the dire need, if even approximate justice is to be done and an American court saved to respect, for more time, more consideration, more earnestness to arrive at the truth, more zeal for human betterment and a gentler feeling for the business in hand, on the part of the personnel directing the affairs of this court. No court, even with the best intentions on the part of the magistrate, can rise higher than the plane of public thought and sentiment; nor can it ever sink below it.

HUGO WINTNER.  
New York, June 30, 1916.

**As Bad as Ever.**

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir: Referring to your editorial in this morning's Tribune, "Abating a Nuisance," the obnoxious odors that awful stench from the Jersey shore factories—were as bad last night at about 11 to 12 o'clock as almost any time during the past year. It is outrageous that we should have to stand such pollution of the atmosphere. It is not only objectionable, but affects one with a sensitive throat, and I am one of these. I protest as a resident and taxpayer.

A WEST SIDER.  
New York, June 30, 1916.